Appl. No. 10/766,158 Amdt. Dated Mar. 10 ,2005

Reply to Office Action of Dec. 10, 2004

## <u>REMARKS</u>

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 6-9, 11 and 12.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In response to the above rejections, applicants have added a limitation about the mother board in the independent claim 10 to overcome the rejections.

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In response to the above rejections, applicants have cancelled claims 15-16 without prejudice.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-4, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Landman (3,701,071).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection about claim 1 due to the following reasons

Regard to claim 1, an electrical connector assembly defined therein comprises a mother board, a card edge connector mounted on the mother board and comprising a housing defining a slot, and a plurality of contacts disposed on at least one side of the slot of the housing and exposed into the slot, a daughter card comprising a mating edge inserted into the slot of the housing, a plurality of conductive pads on the mating edge for electrically connecting with the contacts of the card edge connector, a board hold down, which is separated from the card edge

Appl. No. 10/766,158 Amdt. Dated Mar. 10,2005 Reply to Office Action of Dec. 10, 2004

connector and mounted on the mother board, holding the daughter card in the card edge connector and keeping the daughter card parallel to the mother board.

Refer to FIGS. 1-2 of Landman, a hinge type circuit board connector defined therein comprises a mother board 14, a plastic body 10 having a circuit board support 18 and a base 12 hinged with the board support 18. The base 12 includes a row of terminal receiving cavities 24 into which are inserted metal spring terminals 26 (Column 3, Lines 1-2). The support 18 defining a pair of slots 44 in arms 42 thereof and the circuit board 48 mounted in support 18 by inserting it into the slots 44 (Column 3, Lines 20-25).

Apparently, the "cavity 24" of the base 12 and the "slot 44" of the support 18 are two elements defined in Landman patent which have different structure and perform different functions. Therefore, what we claimed in claim 1 that the housing defines the slot, the contacts are disposed in the slot and the daughter card is inserted into the slot, obviously, do not be mentioned by Landman. For this reason, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 should be allowable since they are dependent from claim 1, directly or indirectly.

Regard to amended claim 10, an electrical connector assembly defined therein comprises a mother board, a card edge connector mounted on the mother board and comprising a housing defining a slot having an opening at one side of the card edge connector, and a plurality of contacts disposed on at least one side of the slot of the housing and exposed into the slot, and a board hold down mounted on the mother board, said board hold down being separated from and located beside the one side of card edge connector, the board hold down and the slot of housing together defining a support plane adapted for supporting a daughter card.

Refer to FIGS. 1-2, Landman discloses a hinge type circuit board connector defined therein comprising a mother board 14, a plastic body 10 having a circuit

Appl. No. 10/766,158 Amdt. Dated Mar. 10 ,2005

Reply to Office Action of Dec. 10, 2004

board support 18 and a base 12 hinged with the board support 18. The support 18 defining a pair of slots 44 in arms 42 thereof and the circuit board 48 mounted in support 18 by inserting it into the slots 44 (Column 3, Lines 20-25). A flexible latching member 52 is secured to the circuit board 14 a distance away from plastic body 10 and is used to prevent a daughter card departing away from the circuit board. Obviously, there is no such a support plane for the daughter card described in Landman patent.

Therefore, claim 10 is not anticipated by Landman.

Regard to amended claim 13, an electrical connector assembly defined therein comprises a first circuit board, a card edge connector mounted to the first circuit board and defining a slot with a plurality of contacts within said slot, a second circuit board having a front edge section angularly inserted into the slot and downwardly rotated toward the first circuit board until reaching a parallel relation with the first circuit board, and a deflectable board holder mounted to the first circuit board, said board holder is located around a rear edge section of the second circuit board and downwardly presses said rear edge section.

Refer to FIGS. 1-2 of Landman, a hinge type circuit board connector defined therein comprises a mother board 14, a plastic body 10 having a circuit board support 18 and a base 12 hinged with the board support 18. The base 12 includes a row of terminal receiving cavities 24 into which are inserted metal spring terminals 26 (Column 3, Lines 1-2). The support 18 defining a pair of slots 44 in arms 42 thereof and the circuit board 48 mounted in support 18 by inserting it into the slots 44 (Column 3, Lines 20-25).

Apparently, the "cavity 24" of the base 12 and the "slot 44" of the support 18 are two elements defined in Landman patent which have different structure and perform different functions. Therefore, what we claimed in claim 1 that the housing defines the slot, the contacts are disposed in the slot and the daughter card is inserted into the slot, obviously, do not be mentioned by Landman. For this

Appl. No. 10/766,158 Amdt. Dated Mar. 10,2005 Reply to Office Action of Dec. 10, 2004

reason, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, claim 13 is not anticipated by Landman.

Amended claim 14 depending from claim 13 further recites a resilient arm and an anti-overstress portion respectively extending from opposite ends of the body portion, which is not disclosed by Landman.

Therefore, claim 14 should carry more patentability than Landman in addition to dependent from claim 13.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Landman in view of Shipe et al. (6,773,268).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection about the dependent claim 5 due to the following reasons.

Claim 5 depending from claim 2 further recites the board hold down comprising a body portion supporting the daughter card to keep a predetermined distance between the daughter card and the mother board, a leg portion extending downwardly from the body portion, the mother board defines a retention hole receiving the leg portion of the board hold down.

Refer to FIG. 1 of Shipe, a board hold down 1 for fastening a first and a second circuit boards 8, 9 defined therein comprises a support member 10. The support member 10 includes an upper mounting portion 12 and a lower mounting portion 11. An intermediate portion 14 interconnects the upper and the lower mounting portion 12, 11. The lower mounting portion 11 downwardly extending from the body portion 14. The body portion 14 is substantially a column, while the mounting portion 11 is configured in a general "U" shape in the cross section.

Appl. No. 10/766,158 Amdt. Dated Mar. 10,2005 Reply to Office Action of Dec. 10, 2004

Further refer to FIGS. 1-2 of Landman, the hinge type circuit board connector comprises a plastic body 10 having a support 18 and a base 12 hinged with the support 18. The support 18 defines a pair of slots 44 for receiving the daughter card 48, while the base 12 defines a row of receiving cavity for receiving the terminals 26. A latching member 52 is distance away the plastic body 10 and is used to hold the daughter card 48. The terminal 26 includes a curved spring contact portion 38 extend above the base 12. As the daughter card 48 and support 18 are rotated toward the base 12, the spring contact portion 38 is compressed and engages with the daughter card 48, and at the same time, the spring contact portion 38 provides an upward spring force to support the daughter card 48. The latch member 52 provides the daughter card 48 a downward force for preventing the daughter card 48 disengaging (Column 3, Lines 59-68, Column 4, Lines 1-3). Apparently, there is no suggestion in Landman to notify the latch member.

Therefore, claim 5 is allowable over Landman in view of Shipe under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The newly added claims 17-19 should be allowable since they are dependent from claim 13, indirectly.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Korsunsky et al

Appl. No. 10/766,158 Amdt. Dated Mar. 10,2005

Reply to Office Action of Dec. 10, 2004

Registration No.: 43,325 Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137